

Learning Novel Transformer Architecture for Time-series Forecasting

Juyuan Zhang
Nanyang Technological University
SG, Singapore
JZHANG161@e.ntu.edu.sg

Wei Zhu
University of Hong Kong
Hong Kong, China
michaelwzhu91@gmail.com

Jiechao Gao
University of Virginia
VA, United States
jg5ycn@virginia.edu

Abstract

Despite the success of Transformer-based models in the time-series prediction (TSP) tasks, the existing Transformer architecture still face limitations and the literature lacks comprehensive explorations into alternative architectures. To address these challenges, we propose AutoFormer-TS, a novel framework that leverages a comprehensive search space for Transformer architectures tailored to TSP tasks. Our framework introduces a differentiable neural architecture search (DNAS) method, AB-DARTS, which improves upon existing DNAS approaches by enhancing the identification of optimal operations within the architecture. AutoFormer-TS systematically explores alternative attention mechanisms, activation functions, and encoding operations, moving beyond the traditional Transformer design. Extensive experiments demonstrate that AutoFormer-TS consistently outperforms state-of-the-art baselines across various TSP benchmarks, achieving superior forecasting accuracy while maintaining reasonable training efficiency.¹

CCS Concepts

- **Computing methodologies** → **Machine learning algorithms;**
- **Information systems** → **Data mining; Data analytics.**

Keywords

Time series modeling, Transformer, neural architecture search

ACM Reference Format:

Juyuan Zhang, Wei Zhu, and Jiechao Gao. 2018. Learning Novel Transformer Architecture for Time-series Forecasting. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

Time series forecasting (TSP) represents a crucial modeling endeavor [20], spanning a wide array of practical applications such as climate modeling, inventory management, and energy demand prediction. Many efforts have been devoted in proposing different types

¹Code will be publicly available upon acceptance.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference acronym 'XX, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/2018/06
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

of models to enhance the performance of TSP. In the 1970s, the dominant approaches are the statistical models like ARMA, ARIMA [6], GARCH [1], and structural models [5]. With the raise of machine learning (ML) in the 1990s, many ML approaches have been applied to TSP, such as SVM [30], decision tree, and ensemble models like Gradient boosting regression tree (GBRT) [11]. In the deep learning (DL) era, various deep learning-based time series models, including recurrent neural networks, convolutional neural networks, linear models and Transformer [45], are proposed in the literature. Among these models, Transformer [41] now plays an important role in the recent works like iTransformer [27] and PatchTST [32], achieving better performances across different benchmark tasks.

With the widespread applications of Transformer in different domains and modalities, the research field has witnessed many sophisticated Transformer variants tailored for TSP [21, 47, 52, 53]. However, the existing methods have the following limitations. First, a branch of Transformer-based methods focused on manually altering the attention mechanisms [52]. However, these works focused on designing more efficient attention functions, reducing the overall complexity. However, as [32] demonstrates, these models fail to perform well on the TSP tasks, and have been outperformed by simple architectures like multi-layer perceptrons (MLPs). Second, recent models like iTransformer [27] and PatchTST [32] have shown that with the proper tokenization methods, the Transformer model can achieve the state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance with the original architecture design. However, alternative architectures have not been fully investigated.

To address the above issues, we propose the AutoFormer-TS framework (see Figure 1). First, we look into the architecture of the vanilla Transformer, and design a comprehensive search space for TSP Transformer models. Our search space contains alternative attention mechanisms, activation functions, and encoding operations that substitute the residual connections. As for the search algorithm, we employ the differentiable neural architecture search (DNAS) [25] framework. We have looked into the workflow of DNAS and find that the current DNAS methods may have shortcomings in identifying which operations to keep. Thus, we propose a novel DNAS method, AB-DARTS.

Extensive experimentation has proved that our AutoFormer-TS framework can successfully identify architectures that surpasses recent state-of-the-art baseline methods on the TSP task at hand. The contributions of our work are summarized as follows:

- Our AutoFormer-TS framework constructs a comprehensive and compact search space, which identifies the alternative operations or functions that could benefit the Transformer architecture.

- Our AutoFormer-TS framework proposes a novel DNAS method, AB-DARTS, which modifies the mechanism of identifying the most contributing operation on an edge of the hyper-network.
- AutoFormer-TS consistently exceeds the state-of-the-art performance in TS forecasting tasks, while requiring reasonable training time cost.

2 Related works

2.1 Time series modeling

As a classical research problem with widespread applications, models constructed from the statistical approaches for time series modeling have been used from the 1970s. The representative models are autoregressive integrated moving average (ARIMA) [6], exponential smoothing [13], and structural models [5]. The most significant characteristic for these methods is that they require significant domain expertise to build. With the development of machine learning (ML) [4], many ML techniques are introduced to time series modeling to reduce manual efforts. Gradient boosting regression tree (GBRT) [11, 35] gains popularity by learning the temporal dynamics of time series in a data-driven manner. However, these methods still require manual feature engineering and model designs. With the powerful representation learning capability of deep learning (DL) from large-scale data, various deep learning-based time series models are proposed in the literature [23], achieving better forecasting accuracy than traditional techniques in many cases. Before the era of Transformer [41], the two popular DL architectures are: (a) Recurrent neural networks (RNNs) based methods [17], which summarize the past information compactly in internal memory states and recursively update themselves for forecasting. (b) Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) based methods [22], wherein convolutional filters are used to capture local temporal features. More recently, multi-layer perceptron (MLP) based methods, like [40] and [51], have raised attention in the research field, since these models are simple and light-weight.

2.2 Transformer architectures in time series

The progressive advancements in natural language processing and computer vision have led to the development of sophisticated Transformer [42] variants tailored for a wide array of time series forecasting applications [47, 52]. Central to these innovations is the methodology by which Transformers handle time series data. For instance, iTransformer [27] treats each univariate time series as a distinct token, forming multivariate time series into sequences of such tokens. More recently, PatchTST [32] adopts an assumption of channel independence, transforming a univariate time series into multiple patches, which are subsequently treated as tokens and processed through a Transformer encoder. Another important research direction is to design alternative Transformer architectures. This branch of works mainly devote themselves into manually designing novel attention mechanisms, including Reformer [21], Informer [52], AutoFormer [47], FEDformer[53].

2.3 Neural architecture search methods

In the early attempts, NAS requires massive computations, like thousands of GPU days [24, 55, 56]. Recently, a particular group of one-shot NAS, led by the seminal work DARTS [26] has attracted much attention. DARTS formulates the search space into a super-network that can adjust itself in a continuous space so that the network and architectural parameters can be optimized alternately (bi-level optimization) using gradient descent. A series of literature try to improve the performance and efficiency of DARTS, such as [8, 9, 31, 48]. SNAS [48] reformulate DARTS as a credit assignment task while maintaining the differentiability. [12] penalize the entropy of the architecture parameters to encourage discretization on the hyper-network. P-DARTS [8] analyze the issues during the DARTS bi-level optimization, and propose a series of modifications. PC-DARTS [50] reduces the memory cost during search by sampling a portion of the channels in super-networks. FairDARTS [9] change the softmax operations in DARTS into sigmoid and introduce a zero-one loss to prune the architectural parameters. XNAS [31] dynamically wipes out inferior architectures and enhances superior ones.

Our work complements the literature by the following two aspects: (a) we conduct a pilot experiment to analyze the shortcomings of the current DNAS methods; (b) we propose a novel DNAS method that can achieve better search performances and search stability.

3 Search Space Design

Now we discuss our search space in detail. Since our goal here is to optimize the transformer architecture, we keep its main bone structure, as shown in Figure 1. We design a comprehensive search space for discovering novel self-attention structures as well as the novel architectures for the pointwise feed-forward module.

3.1 Search Space for the self-attention module

As shown in Figure 1, the original self-attention mechanism in the Transformer model can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} q_i &= x_i W_Q, \\ k_j &= x_j W_K, \\ s_{i,j} &= q_i^T \odot k_j, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $x_i, x_j \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times d_m}$ is the input tokens i and j 's hidden representations. $i, j \leq l$, where l is the sequence length and d_m is the model's hidden dimension. The above dot-product attention mechanism (denoted as Dot_Attn), i.e., how to compute the attention scores $s_{i,j}$ between any token pairs, is the core to the self-attention module [41].²

Although Dot_Attn in Equation 1 is the most widely used one in the Transformer models in the literature. However, there are also a wide collection of attention functions in the literature. Here we present four alternative attention mechanisms:

²Here we do not include the multi-head aspect in the attention module to simplify the math expressions. However, we will implement the multi-head attention module in the experiments.




Figure 1: The architecture for our AutoFormer-TS framework .

- Elementwise product attention [37] (denoted as EP_Attn), where the attention score is calculated as the Hardmard product between q_i and k_j :

$$s_{i,j} = \tanh(q_i \odot k_j)^\top W_d, \quad (2)$$

where $W_d \in \mathbb{R}^{d_m \times 1}$ is the learnable parameter matrix, \odot is the Hardmard product operation, and $\tanh()$ is the hyperbolic tangent function.

- Bilinear attention [44] (Bilinear_Attn), where the attention score is calculated as the bilinear product between q_i and k_j :

$$s_{i,j} = q_i^\top W_d k_j, \quad (3)$$

where $W_d \in \mathbb{R}^{d_m \times d_m}$ is the learnable parameter matrix.

- Concat attention [43] (Concat_Attn), where the attention score is calculated by concatenating the query and key vectors and going through an activation function and a linear projection layer:

$$s_{i,j} = \tanh(\text{concat}([q_i, k_j]))^\top W_d, \quad (4)$$

where $W_d \in \mathbb{R}^{d_m \times 1}$ is the learnable parameter matrix.

- Minus attention [39] (Minus_Attn), where the attention score is calculated by letting the query vector to subtract the key vector and going through an activation function and a linear projection layer:

$$s_{i,j} = \tanh(q_i - k_j)^\top W_d, \quad (5)$$

where $W_d \in \mathbb{R}^{d_m \times 1}$ is the learnable parameter matrix.

In our search space, the above mentioned five attention functions will constitute the attention function search space.

3.2 Search Space for the feed-forward module

As shown in Figure 1, the original feed-forward network (FFN) module is:

$$FFN(X) = \text{Proj}_{down,k}(g(\text{Proj}_{up,k}(X))), \quad (6)$$

where $\text{Proj}_{up,k}$ is the linear layer that projects the input from dimension d_m to d_{ffn} . Here, d_{ffn} denotes the intermediate dimension, k denotes the dimension multiplication factor:

$$d_{ffn} = k * d_m. \quad (7)$$

$\text{Proj}_{down,k}$ projects the input from d_{ffn} to d_m , and $g()$ is the activation function. In the original Transformer [41], $k = 4$, and $g()$ is the ReLU activation. To construct the search space for the AutoFormer-TS framework, we now consider the following alternative design choices: (a) setting k to one of $\{0.5, 1, 2, 4\}$. (b) Setting the activation function $g()$ to ReLU [15], Leaky_ReLU [49], SWISH [36], GeLU [16] and ELU [10]. The activation functions are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Activation functions in the search space.

Name	Function
ReLU	$\max(x, 0)$
Leaky_ReLU	x if $x \geq 0$ else $1e-2 * x$
ELU	x if $x \geq 0$ else $e^x - 1$
SWISH	$x * Sigmoid(x)$
GeLU	$0.5 * x * (1 + erf(x/\sqrt{2}))$

3.3 Search Space for encoding operations

In the original Transformer model, the two core modules include residue connections:

$$\begin{aligned} X^{(1)} &= \text{Attn}(X) + X, \\ X' &= \text{FFN}(X^{(1)}) + X^{(1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

However, as demonstrated in [38], when substituting some of the residue connections with proper encoding operations like convolutions, the model performance could improve. This observation is intuitive: different encoding operations could provide semantic information from different perspective, enriching the hidden representations of the look-back window. So the above equations become:

$$\begin{aligned} X^{(1)} &= \text{Attn}(X) + \text{Enc}_A(X), \\ X' &= \text{FFN}(X^{(1)}) + \text{Enc}_F(X^{(1)}), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\text{Enc}_A()$ and $\text{Enc}_F()$ are encoding operations. Thus, it is natural for us to consider the following search space for the encoding operations in our AutoFormer-TS framework:

- Special zero operation, denoted as Null;
- Skip connection, denoted as Skip;
- 1-d convolutions, with kernel size k , where $k = 1, 3, 5$, denoted as Conv_k ;

3.4 Summary of the whole search space

Based on the above analysis of the alternative design choices of Transformer for the time series model, we now formally introduce our whole search space:

- The encoding operation accompanying the self-attention module: { Null, Skip, Conv_1 , Conv_3 , Conv_5 };
- The encoding operation accompanying the FFN module: { Null, Skip, Conv_1 , Conv_3 , Conv_5 };
- The attention function Attn_Func in the self-attention module: {Dot_Attn, EP_Attn, Bilinear_Attn, Concat_Attn, Minus_Attn};
- The activation function $g()$ in the FFN module: {ReLU, ELU, SWISH, Leaky_ReLU, GeLU};
- The dimension multiplication factor k : {0.5, 1, 2, 4}.

For a Transformer model with 3 blocks, our search space contains $1.56e+10$ number combinations of possible transformer architectures, which is quite a large search space. Next, we will show how to

navigate through this enormous search space and obtain architectures that are better than standard Transformer model efficiently.

4 Search algorithm

4.1 Preliminaries on differentiable neural architecture search

Now we give a brief introduction to the representative differentiable neural architecture search algorithm, DARTS [25]. During the search stage, DARTS initialize a hyper-network which is a connected directed acyclic graph (DAG) with N nodes. Each node Node_i is referred to as a search cell, which combines a set of n_i operations $\{o_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^{n_i}$ via a weighted sum. Denote the architectural parameter for $o_{i,j}$ as $\alpha_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}$, then the Node_i represents the following operation:

$$\text{Node}_i(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} o_{i,j}(x), \quad (10)$$

in which $\{w_{i,j}\}_{j=1}^{n_i}$ are given by:

$$w_{i,j} = \frac{\exp(\alpha_{i,j})}{\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \exp(\alpha_{i,j})}. \quad (11)$$

This design makes the entire framework differentiable to both layer weights and architectural parameters $\alpha_{i,j}$ so that it is possible to perform architecture search in an end-to-end fashion. The standard optimization method is the bi-level optimization proposed in DARTS, which splits the training set \mathcal{D}_{train} into two subsets \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 , one for network parameter updates and the other for updating the architectural parameters. Both groups of parameters are updated via gradient descent. After the search process is completed, the discretization procedure extracts the final sub-network by selecting the operation on each node with the highest $\alpha_{i,j}$ score and dropping the low-scored operations. And the final network will train on the original train set with randomly initialized parameters.

4.2 Motivation

Note that the DARTS workflow select the operation on each node based on the architectural parameter $\alpha_{i,j}$, which is based on the hypothesis that the architectural parameter $\alpha_{i,j}$ can reliably reflect the quality or importance of operation $o_{i,j}$. However, We have conducted a pilot experiment demonstrating that architectural parameters in DARTS [26] can not reflect the performance of its discretized sub-networks, resulting in sub-optimal search results.³ This result motivates us to propose a simple-yet-effective modification to the DARTS-style architecture search. Instead of relying on the architecture weights' values to select the best operation, we propose directly evaluating the operation's superiority by its influence on the hyper-network's performances. Since our method mimics the process of conducting ablation studies of a certain operation on a node from the hyper-network, we refer to our method as the ablation-based differentiable architecture search (AB-DARTS).

³The performance of the original DARTS will be presented as ablation studeis in Table 4, supporting our claims.

4.3 Calculating the superiority of each operation

We first introduce the core of our AB-DARTS method: the calculation of each operation’s superiority score, defined as how much it affects the performance of the hyper-network. Denote the complete hyper-network as M . Hyper-network M is trained till convergence on the training set. We now consider a modified hyper-network obtained by masking out an operation $o_{i,j}$ on Node $_i$ while keeping all other operations on the node. This new hyper-network is denoted as $M_{\setminus o_{i,j}}$. We evaluate the two versions of hyper-networks on the validation data D_{val} . Denote the metric score as a function of a model M , $S(M)$, with the validation data fixed. Then the contribution score of operation $o_{i,j}$ is given by:

$$CS(o_{i,j}) = S(M) - S(M_{\setminus o_{i,j}}). \quad (12)$$

Note that in the above equation, $S(M)$ can be treated as a constant term. Thus the above equation can be simplified to $CS(o_{i,j}) = -S(M_{\setminus o_{i,j}})$. The operation that results in the most significant drop upon masking in the hyper-network’s validation metric will be considered the most critical operation on that edge. In the experiments, we set $S()$ as the negative of the cross-entropy (CE) loss since the widely applied metrics like accuracy may not vary if the hyper-network only masks out a single operation.

4.4 The complete process of AB-DARTS

We now describe the whole process of our AB-DARTS method. Our AB-DARTS method requires the hyper-network to be trained for $K_1 > 0$ epochs until convergence on the train set. Note that different from [25], we freeze the architectural parameters and train only the model parameters on the train set D_{train} . No bi-level optimization is required, thus saving training time costs. Then, we traverse over all the operations on every node. For each node Node $_i$ of the hyper-network, we evaluate the superiority of each operation $o_{i,j}$ on the development set D_{val} . Then we select the operation o_i^* that receives the highest superiority score for discretizing this node, that is, keeping this operation and dropping all other operations on this node. After the discretization of a node, we tune the altered hyper-network for $K_2 > 0$ epochs to make the remaining hyper-network recover the lost performance. The above steps are repeated until all the nodes are discretized for the hyper-network, and we obtain the sub-network’s architecture. Then the sub-network M_S is randomly initialized and trained on the D_{train} for $K_3 > 0$ epochs. Formally, we summarize the above process in Algorithm 1.

5 Experiments

5.1 Baselines

We compare our AutoFormer-TS method with the three groups of SOTA time series models on the long-horizon forecasting tasks: (a) deep learning based models, including DLinear [51] and TimesNet [46]; (b) Transformer-based models, including FedFormer [53], Autoformer [47], Informer [52], Reformer [21], iTransformer [27] and PatchTST [32]; (c) Time-series models based on pretrained models, either pretrained on the large-scale time series corpus or the other modality. These types of methods include MOMENT [14],

Algorithm 1: Ablation-based differentiable architecture search

Input: Hyper-network M with N nodes;
Output: Sub-network M_S , with the set of selected operations $\{o_i^*\}_{i=1}^N$
Data: Training set D_{train} , validation data D_{val}

- 1 Train the hyper-network M on the training set D_{train} for K_1 epochs;
- 2 **for** node index $1 \leq i \leq N$ **do**
- 3 **for** operation $o_{i,j}$ on node Node $_i$ **do**
- 4 Calculate the superiority score $CS(o_{i,j})$ on D_{val} ;
- 5 Select the best operation $o_i^* \leftarrow \arg \max_j CS(o_{i,j})$;
- 6 Discretize Node $_i$ of hyper-network M by only keeping o_i^* ;
- 7 Further train the hyper-network M on D_{train} for K_2 epochs;
- 8 Train the sub-network M_S on the training set D_{train} for K_3 epochs;

Time-LLM [19], GPT4TS [54]. On the short-term forecasting tasks, we further compare our model with N-HiTS [7] and N-BEATS [33].

5.2 Datasets and evaluation metrics

For long-term time series forecasting, we assess our Time-Llama framework on the following datasets, in accordance with [46]: ETTh1, ETTh2, ETTm1, ETTm2, Weather, Electricity (ECL), Traffic and ILL. These tasks have been extensively adopted for benchmarking long-term forecasting models. The input time series length T_L is set as 512, and we use four different prediction horizons $T_p \in \{96, 192, 336, 720\}$. The evaluation metrics utilized are the mean square error (MSE) and the mean absolute error (MAE).

For short-term time series forecasting, we employ the M4 benchmark [29]. This benchmark contains a collection of marketing data in different sampling frequencies. The prediction horizons are relatively small and in $\{6, 48\}$, and The input lengths are twice as prediction horizons. The evaluation metrics for this benchmark include the symmetric mean absolute percentage error (SMAPE), the mean scaled absolute error (MSAE), and the overall weighted average (OWA).

The introduction to the datasets and the evaluation metrics are presented in Appendix A.

5.3 Experimental setups

Devices We run all our experiments on NVIDIA 4090ti (24GB) GPUs.

Hyper-parameters for the architecture search stage Our AB-DARTS method in our AutoFormer-TS framework divides the workflow into two stages, the architecture search stage and architecture training stage. During the architecture search stage, the hyper-network is initialized with the weighted operations and all the architectural parameters are uniformly initialized. The hyper-network has three Transformer blocks, and the hidden size is 256. For time series tokenization, we utilize the patching strategy introduced in [32], with patch length 16 and stride 8. The time series

Table 2: Results for the long-term forecasting tasks. The prediction horizon T_p is one of $\{24, 36, 48, 60\}$ for ILI and one of $\{96, 192, 336, 720\}$ for the others. Lower value indicates better performance. Bold values represent the best score, while Underlined means the second best score.

Task	ETTh1		ETTh2		ETTm1		ETTm2		Weather		ECL		Traffic		ILI	
	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE	MSE	MAE
DLinear	0.422	0.437	0.431	0.446	0.357	<u>0.378</u>	0.267	0.333	0.248	0.300	0.166	0.263	0.433	0.295	2.169	1.041
TimesNet	0.458	0.450	0.414	0.427	0.400	0.406	0.291	0.333	0.259	0.287	0.192	0.295	0.620	0.336	2.139	0.931
Autoformer	0.496	0.487	0.450	0.459	0.588	0.517	0.327	0.371	0.338	0.382	0.227	0.338	0.628	0.379	3.006	1.161
Informer	1.040	0.795	4.431	1.729	0.961	0.734	1.410	0.810	0.634	0.548	0.311	0.397	0.764	0.416	5.137	1.544
Reformer	1.029	0.805	6.736	2.191	0.799	0.671	1.479	0.915	0.803	0.656	0.338	0.422	0.741	0.422	4.724	1.445
FedFormer	0.440	0.460	0.437	0.449	0.448	0.452	0.305	0.349	0.309	0.360	0.214	0.327	0.610	0.376	2.847	1.144
iTransformer	0.440	0.460	0.437	0.449	0.448	0.452	0.305	0.349	0.309	0.360	0.214	0.327	0.610	0.376	2.847	1.144
PatchTST	<u>0.413</u>	<u>0.430</u>	<u>0.330</u>	<u>0.379</u>	0.351	0.380	<u>0.255</u>	<u>0.315</u>	0.225	0.264	<u>0.161</u>	<u>0.252</u>	<u>0.390</u>	<u>0.263</u>	<u>1.443</u>	<u>0.797</u>
MOMENT	0.418	0.436	0.352	0.394	0.344	0.379	0.278	0.321	0.228	0.269	0.171	0.272	0.410	0.297	1.952	1.107
Time-LLM	0.428	0.433	0.344	0.393	<u>0.339</u>	0.382	0.271	0.319	<u>0.225</u>	<u>0.257</u>	0.168	0.262	0.408	0.286	1.835	0.906
GPT4TS	0.465	0.455	0.381	0.412	0.388	0.403	0.284	0.339	0.237	0.270	0.167	0.263	0.414	0.294	1.925	0.903
AutoFormer-TS (ours)	0.407	0.424	0.327	0.374	0.329	0.372	0.251	0.313	0.225	0.254	0.158	0.252	0.388	0.264	1.435	0.801

patches are projected to the model dimension via a linear layer. The forecasting head follows [32], that is, all the time series token vectors are concatenated and fed into a linear layer to obtain the predicted time series values.

For training the hyper-network, we use AdamW [28] as the optimizer with a linear learning rate decay schedule and 6% of the training steps for warm-up. The learning rate is set to $1e-4$. The batch size is set according to the training set size, so that each training epoch contains around 256 to 512 optimization steps. During training, the architectural weights are frozen. The contribution score for each operation is calculated on the development set D_{dev} . For training epochs, we set $K_1 = 5$ and $K_2 = 1$. Once the hyper-network is fully discretized, we obtain the learned sub-network on the task at hand.

Hyper-parameters for the learned architectures The hyper-parameters for the learned architectures that is related to the model sizes will be kept the same with the search stage. The number of Transformer blocks is 3, and different blocks may have different architectures, that is, different attention mechanisms, different activation functions, or different encoding operations.

Hyper-parameters for the learned architectures' training and evaluation For training the learned architectures, we keep the training settings almost the same with the search stage. Except that during training at this stage, no contribution scores are needed. The number of epochs is $K = 50$. Early stopping with maximum patience 10 is set. The model is evaluated at the development set D_{dev} every 100 training steps. If the patience exceeds 10, that is, the model's evaluation performance does not improve for the last ten evaluation run, then the model will stop training. And the checkpoint with the best evaluation performance will be used to make predictions on the test set.

Reproducibility We run the search stage once for each task. And the learned sub-network for each task will be run under five

different random seeds and the mean performance on the test set will be reported.

5.4 Main results

Results for long-term forecasting In Table 2, we report the average score over four different prediction horizons for the long-horizon time series forecasting tasks. The experimental results demonstrate that our AutoFormer-TS method outperforms the baselines on most of the (task, prediction horizon) pairs. When compared to the previous state-of-the-art (SOTA) model PatchTST, TimeLlama can also achieves advantages. The comparisons against MOMENT, Time-LLM and GPT4TS are also meaningful. These three are very recent works on adapting large language models to the time-series forecasting tasks.

Results for short-term forecasting To demonstrate that our method works in the short-term forecasting tasks, we utilize the M4 benchmark [29]. Table 3 reports the SMAPE, MSAE and OWA scores. Our experimental results demonstrate that our AutoFormer-TS method consistently surpasses all baselines when conducting short-term time series predictions.

Visualization of the learned architectures We present the third Transformer layers of the learned architectures on the ETTh1, ETTm1 and M4 tasks in Figure 2. The whole detailed architectures on each of the tasks are presented in Table 8 in Appendix B. From the learned architectures, we can observe that:

- We observe task specificity for the best architectures found on different tasks are different, emphasizing the importance of task specificity. Note that task specificity is needed to obtain the SOTA performance on each task, but we will also show that the architectures have transferability to a certain degree on Table 6.
- We notice that the task with smaller dataset size prefers a more light-weighted architecture. For example, the ETTh1's

Table 3: Results for the short-term time series forecasting task, M4. The forecasting horizons are in {6, 48}. Lower value indicates better performance. Bold values represent the best score, while Underlined means the second best.

Method		AutoFormer-TS (ours)	GPT4TS	TIME-LLM	MOMENT	PatchTST	DLinear	TimesNet	FEDformer	N-HiTS	N-BEATS
Yearly	SMAPE	13.11	15.11	13.62	13.72	13.68	16.96	15.37	14.02	<u>13.42</u>	13.48
	MSAE	3.01	3.56	3.06	3.07	3.12	4.28	3.55	3.04	3.06	<u>3.04</u>
	OWA	0.78	0.91	<u>0.79</u>	0.81	0.79	1.06	0.92	0.81	0.80	0.79
Quarterly	SMAPE	10.06	10.59	10.52	10.96	10.38	12.14	10.46	11.10	<u>10.19</u>	10.56
	MSAE	1.16	1.25	<u>1.18</u>	1.32	1.23	1.52	1.22	1.35	1.18	1.25
	OWA	<u>0.89</u>	0.94	0.89	0.98	0.92	1.11	0.92	0.99	0.89	0.93
Monthly	SMAPE	12.96	13.26	13.10	13.92	<u>12.96</u>	13.51	13.51	14.40	13.06	13.09
	MSAE	<u>0.99</u>	1.00	1.10	1.09	0.97	1.03	1.03	1.14	1.01	0.99
	OWA	0.90	0.93	0.94	0.99	<u>0.91</u>	0.95	0.95	1.03	0.92	0.92
Others	SMAPE	4.51	6.12	4.93	6.30	4.95	6.70	6.91	7.15	<u>4.71</u>	6.59
	MSAE	2.81	4.11	<u>2.95</u>	4.06	3.34	4.95	4.50	4.04	3.05	4.43
	OWA	0.94	1.25	<u>0.96</u>	1.30	1.04	1.48	1.43	1.38	0.97	1.39
Average	SMAPE	11.69	12.69	<u>11.92</u>	12.78	12.05	13.63	12.88	13.16	12.035	12.25
	MSAE	1.54	1.808	<u>1.57</u>	1.75	1.62	2.09	1.83	1.77	1.62	1.69
	OWA	0.81	0.94	<u>0.87</u>	0.93	0.86	1.05	0.95	0.94	0.87	0.89

model set the dimension multiplication factor k to be 0.5 at the second layer, and 1 for the first and third layers.

- We observe that in many of the tasks, the convolution operations act as the encoding operations accompanying the self-attention module and FFN modules. These design patterns are also observed in [18, 38?]. Intuitively, convolution operations extract local features similar to n-gram, which complement long-term dependency features captured by self-attention.

5.5 Ablation studies and further analysis

Ablations on the search algorithm Note that the main experiments (Table 2 and 3) employ our AB-DARTS method (Section 4) to conduct search on our search space. In order to demonstrate the effectiveness of our method, we now substitute the search algorithm by a series of baseline neural architecture search algorithms: (a) DARTS [25]; (b) Stable-DARTS [2]; (c) Gold-NAS [3]; (d) ENAS [34]. The experiments are conducted on the ETTh1, ETTm1 and M4-Yearly tasks, and the results are reported in Table 4. The experimental results show that the AB-DARTS result in the best performance, demonstrating its effectiveness in selecting appropriate operations for the task at hand. The effectiveness of our AutoFormer-TS framework comes from the superiority scoring method for the operations during architecture search.

Ablation studies on the search space We now conduct an ablation study of our search space by reducing our search space \mathcal{S} to a singleton containing the vanilla Transformer architecture step-by-step: (a) reduce the search space by restricting that the Transformer architecture must be identical across different blocks (denoted as search space \mathcal{S}_1). This type of search space is referred to as the micro search space [25], whereas the one in our main experiments is referred to as the macro search space. Intuitively, the macro search space is much larger than the micro one by allowing more flexible

Table 4: Results for the ablation studies on the architecture search algorithms.

Task	ETTh1	ETTh1	M4	
	MSE	MSE	SMAPE	MSAE
A-DARTS (ours)	0.407	0.329	13.11	3.01
DARTS	0.412	0.346	13.35	3.21
Stable-DARTS	0.411	0.341	13.29	3.19
Gold-NAS	0.415	0.343	13.15	3.17
ENAS	0.413	0.351	13.47	3.24

architectural designs. (b) reduce the activation’s search space by only keeping the **ReLU** activation for $g()$ (denoted as search space \mathcal{S}_2); (c) further reduce the encoding operations’ search space to only include **skip** (\mathcal{S}_3); (c) further restrict the dimension multiplication factor k in the FFN module to $k = 4$ (\mathcal{S}_4). Note that \mathcal{S}_4 contains only the vanilla Transformer in PatchTST [32]. Table 5 reports the results on different search spaces, showing that that dropping any components of the whole search space results in performance losses. The results demonstrate that each components of the search space is necessary and beneficial.

Transferability across tasks Note that the main experiments (Table 2 and 3) demonstrate task specificity under the AutoFormer-TS framework, that is, the learned sub-networks are different across tasks, and achieve SOTA performances. Now we will demonstrate that the learned sub-networks can be transferred to other tasks and achieve reasonable performances. The transferability experiments are conducted on ETTh1, ETTm1 and M4-Yearly, and the results are presented in Table 6. In Table 6, each row presents the learned




Figure 2: The learned architectures on the ETTh1, ETTm1 and M4 tasks.

Table 5: Results for the ablation studies on the search spaces.

Task	ETTh1	ETTm1	M4-Yearly	
	MSE	MSE	SMAPE	MSAE
S	0.407	0.329	13.11	3.01
S_1	0.409	0.331	13.16	3.05
S_2	0.410	0.342	13.45	3.08
S_3	0.410	0.345	13.57	3.10
S_4 (PatchTST)	0.413	0.351	13.68	3.12

models on different tasks, and each column presents the target task. From Table 6, the following observations can be made:

- The best performance are obtained by learning the model on the task at hand, and the transferred model from other tasks performs less well.
- Note that on the two long-horizon forecasting tasks, the transferred models obtain better performance than PatchTST, showing a certain degree of transferability.
- transferability between the long-horizon and short-horizon forecasting tasks are less well. The transferred models performs worse than PatchTST.

On the efficiency of the AutoFormer workflow We use the ETTh1 task to demonstrate the search efficiency. Running the ETTh1 task with PatchTST takes 10.2 min. For searching, DARTS takes 30.6 min for searching new architectures and another 10.5 min for running the obtained architecture. Since AB-DARTS does not require bi-level optimization, it requires 11.5 min for running

Table 6: Results for transferring the learned architectures from one task to another.

Model	ETTh1	ETTm1	M4-Yearly	
	MSE	MSE	SMAPE	MSAE
Learned model on ETTh1	0.407	0.335	13.85	3.18
Learned model on ETTm1	0.411	0.321	13.85	3.18
Learned model on M4-Yearly	0.418	0.367	13.11	3.01
PatchTST	0.413	0.351	13.68	3.12

training steps and 9.4 min for calculating operations' contribution scores. And the re-training stage takes 9.97 min. Our method consumes around three times the training time of PatchTST, which is affordable compared to manually designing different architectures and running numerous evaluations.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we propose the AutoFormer-TS framework, which enhances the performance of Transformer on time series forecasting tasks via searching for novel architectures. First, a novel and comprehensive search space is constructed, allowing for room of improvements via architectural design. Then we introduce a novel AB-DARTS method. This method improves upon existing DNAS approaches by better selecting the proper neural network operations. Extensive experiments proves that AutoFormer-TS consistently outperforms state-of-the-art baselines across various forecasting benchmarks. In addition, our framework is efficient since it does not require too much additional training time.

References

- [1] Luc Bauwens, Sébastien Laurent, and Jeroen VK Rombouts. 2006. Multivariate GARCH models: a survey. *Journal of applied econometrics* 21, 1 (2006), 79–109.
- [2] Kaifeng Bi, Changping Hu, Lingxi Xie, Xin Chen, Longhui Wei, and Qi Tian. 2019. Stabilizing darts with amended gradient estimation on architectural parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.11831* (2019).
- [3] Kaifeng Bi, Lingxi Xie, Xin Chen, Longhui Wei, and Qi Tian. 2020. Gold-nas: Gradual, one-level, differentiable. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.03331* (2020).
- [4] Christopher M Bishop. 2007. Pattern recognition and machine learning (information science and statistics). Springer New York (2007).
- [5] Kenneth A Bollen. 1989. *Structural equations with latent variables*. Vol. 210. John Wiley & Sons.
- [6] George EP Box, Gwilym M Jenkins, Gregory C Reinsel, and Greta M Ljung. 2015. *Time series analysis: forecasting and control*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [7] Cristian Challu, Kin G Olivares, Boris N Oreshkin, Federico Garza Ramirez, Max Mergenthaler Canseco, and Artur Dubrawski. 2023. Nhits: Neural hierarchical interpolation for time series forecasting. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 37. 6989–6997.
- [8] Xin Chen, Lingxi Xie, Jun Wu, and Qi Tian. 2021. Progressive DARTS: Bridging the Optimization Gap for NAS in the Wild. *ArXiv abs/1912.10952* (2021).
- [9] Xiangxiang Chu, Bo Zhang, Ruijun Xu, and Jixiang Li. 2021. FairNAS: Rethinking Evaluation Fairness of Weight Sharing Neural Architecture Search. *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)* (2021), 12219–12228.
- [10] Djork-Arné Clevert. 2015. Fast and accurate deep network learning by exponential linear units (elus). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.07289* (2015).
- [11] Harris Drucker, Corinna Cortes, Lawrence D Jackel, Yann LeCun, and Vladimir Vapnik. 1994. Boosting and other machine learning algorithms. In *Machine Learning Proceedings 1994*. Elsevier, 53–61.
- [12] Yuan Gao, Haoping Bai, Zequn Jie, Jiayi Ma, Kui Jia, and Wei Liu. 2020. MTL-NAS: Task-Agnostic Neural Architecture Search Towards General-Purpose Multi-Task Learning. *2020 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2020), 11540–11549.
- [13] Everette S Gardner Jr. 1985. Exponential smoothing: The state of the art. *Journal of forecasting* 4, 1 (1985), 1–28.
- [14] Mononito Goswami, Konrad Szafer, Arjun Choudhry, Yifu Cai, Shuo Li, and Artur Dubrawski. 2024. Moment: A family of open time-series foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03885* (2024).
- [15] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [16] Dan Hendrycks and Kevin Gimpel. 2016. Gaussian error linear units (gelus). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.08415* (2016).
- [17] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long Short-Term Memory. *Neural Computation* 9 (1997), 1735–1780. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:1915014>
- [18] Zi-Hang Jiang, Weihao Yu, Daquan Zhou, Yunpeng Chen, Jiashi Feng, and Shuicheng Yan. 2020. ConVbert: Improving bert with span-based dynamic convolution. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 12837–12848.
- [19] Ming Jin, Shiyu Wang, Lintao Ma, Zhixuan Chu, James Y Zhang, Xiaoming Shi, Pin-Yu Chen, Yuxuan Liang, Yuan-Fang Li, Shirui Pan, et al. 2023. Time-llm: Time series forecasting by reprogramming large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01728* (2023).
- [20] Ming Jin, Qingsong Wen, Yuxuan Liang, Chaoli Zhang, Siqiao Xue, Xue Wang, James Zhang, Yi Wang, Haifeng Chen, Xiaoli Li, et al. 2023. Large models for time series and spatio-temporal data: A survey and outlook. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10196* (2023).
- [21] Nikita Kitaev, Lukasz Kaiser, and Anselm Levskaya. 2020. Reformer: The efficient transformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.04451* (2020).
- [22] Zewen Li, Fan Liu, Wenjie Yang, Shouheng Peng, and Jun Zhou. 2021. A survey of convolutional neural networks: analysis, applications, and prospects. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems* 33, 12 (2021), 6999–7019.
- [23] Bryan Lim and Stefan Zohren. 2021. Time-series forecasting with deep learning: a survey. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 379, 2194 (2021), 20200209.
- [24] Chenxi Liu, Barret Zoph, Jonathon Shlens, Wei Hua, Li-Jia Li, Li Fei-Fei, Alan Lodon Yuille, Jonathan Huang, and Kevin P. Murphy. 2018. Progressive Neural Architecture Search. In *ECCV*.
- [25] Hanxiao Liu, Karen Simonyan, and Yiming Yang. 2018. Darts: Differentiable architecture search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.09055* (2018).
- [26] Hanxiao Liu, Karen Simonyan, and Yiming Yang. 2019. DARTS: Differentiable Architecture Search. *ArXiv abs/1806.09055* (2019).
- [27] Yong Liu, Tengge Hu, Haoran Zhang, Haixu Wu, Shiyu Wang, Lintao Ma, and Mingsheng Long. 2023. itransformer: Inverted transformers are effective for time series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06625* (2023).
- [28] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. 2019. Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization. In *ICLR*.
- [29] Spyros Makridakis, Evangelos Spiliotis, and Vassilios Assimakopoulos. 2018. The M4 Competition: Results, findings, conclusion and way forward. *International Journal of forecasting* 34, 4 (2018), 802–808.
- [30] David Meyer and FT Wien. 2001. Support vector machines. *R News* 1, 3 (2001), 23–26.
- [31] Niv Nayman, Asaf Noy, T. Ridnik, Itamar Friedman, Rong Jin, and Lihi Zelnik-Manor. 2019. XNAS: Neural Architecture Search with Expert Advice. *ArXiv abs/1906.08031* (2019).
- [32] Yuqi Nie, Nam H Nguyen, Phanwadee Sinthong, and Jayant Kalagnanam. 2022. A time series is worth 64 words: Long-term forecasting with transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.14730* (2022).
- [33] Boris N Oreshkin, Dmitri Carпов, Nicolas Chapados, and Yoshua Bengio. 2019. N-BEATS: Neural basis expansion analysis for interpretable time series forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10437* (2019).
- [34] Hieu Pham, Melody Guan, Barret Zoph, Quoc Le, and Jeff Dean. 2018. Efficient neural architecture search via parameter sharing. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 4095–4104.
- [35] Liudmila Prokhorenkova, Gleb Gusev, Aleksandr Vorobev, Anna Veronika Dorogush, and Andrey Gulin. 2018. CatBoost: unbiased boosting with categorical features. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31 (2018).
- [36] Prajit Ramachandran, Barret Zoph, and Quoc V Le. 2017. Searching for activation functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.05941* (2017).
- [37] Tim Rocktäschel, Edward Grefenstette, Karl Moritz Hermann, Tomáš Kočiský, and Phil Blunsom. 2015. Reasoning about entailment with neural attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.06664* (2015).
- [38] David So, Quoc Le, and Chen Liang. 2019. The evolved transformer. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 5877–5886.
- [39] Chuanqi Tan, Furu Wei, Wenhui Wang, Weifeng Lv, and Ming Zhou. 2018. Multi-way attention networks for modeling sentence pairs.. In *IJCAI* 4411–4417.
- [40] Huanling Tang, Yulin Wang, Yu Zhang, Quansheng Dou, and Mingyu Lu. 2025. TS-Mixer: A lightweight text representation model based on context awareness. *Expert Systems* (2025), e13732.
- [41] A Vaswani. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2017).
- [42] Ashish Vaswani, Noam M. Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is All you Need. *ArXiv abs/1706.03762* (2017).
- [43] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Lio, and Yoshua Bengio. 2017. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903* (2017).
- [44] Shuohang Wang and Jing Jiang. 2015. Learning natural language inference with LSTM. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.08849* (2015).
- [45] Qingsong Wen, Tian Zhou, Chaoli Zhang, Weiqi Chen, Ziqing Ma, Junchi Yan, and Liang Sun. 2022. Transformers in time series: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.07125* (2022).
- [46] Haixu Wu, Tengge Hu, Yong Liu, Hang Zhou, Jianmin Wang, and Mingsheng Long. 2022. Timesnet: Temporal 2d-variation modeling for general time series analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02186* (2022).
- [47] Haixu Wu, Jiehui Xu, Jianmin Wang, and Mingsheng Long. 2021. Autoformer: Decomposition transformers with auto-correlation for long-term series forecasting. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 34 (2021), 22419–22430.
- [48] Sirui Xie, Hehui Zheng, Chunxiao Liu, and Liang Lin. 2019. SNAS: Stochastic Neural Architecture Search. *ArXiv abs/1812.09926* (2019).
- [49] Bing Xu. 2015. Empirical evaluation of rectified activations in convolutional network. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.00853* (2015).
- [50] Yuhui Xu, Lingxi Xie, Wenrui Dai, Xiaopeng Zhang, Xin Chen, Guo-Jun Qi, Hongkai Xiong, and Qi Tian. 2021. Partially-Connected Neural Architecture Search for Reduced Computational Redundancy. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 43 (2021), 2953–2970.
- [51] Ailing Zeng, Muxi Chen, Lei Zhang, and Qiang Xu. 2023. Are transformers effective for time series forecasting?. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 37. 11121–11128.
- [52] Haoyi Zhou, Shanghang Zhang, Jieqi Peng, Shuai Zhang, Jianxin Li, Hui Xiong, and Wancai Zhang. 2021. Informer: Beyond efficient transformer for long sequence time-series forecasting. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 11106–11115.
- [53] Tian Zhou, Ziqing Ma, Qingsong Wen, Xue Wang, Liang Sun, and Rong Jin. 2022. Fedformer: Frequency enhanced decomposed transformer for long-term series forecasting. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 27268–27286.
- [54] Tian Zhou, Peisong Niu, Liang Sun, Rong Jin, et al. 2023. One fits all: Power general time series analysis by pretrained lm. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 36 (2023), 43322–43355.
- [55] Barret Zoph and Quoc V Le. 2017. Neural Architecture Search with Reinforcement Learning. *ArXiv abs/1611.01578* (2017).
- [56] Barret Zoph, Vijay Vasudevan, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V Le. 2018. Learning Transferable Architectures for Scalable Image Recognition. *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (2018), 8697–8710.

A Appendix: datasets and evaluation metrics

A.1 Datasets

We evaluate the long-term forecasting (ltf) performance on the well-established eight different benchmarks, including four ETT datasets (including ETTh1, ETTh2, ETTm1, and ETTm2) from [52], Weather, Electricity, Traffic, and ILL from [47]. For short-term time series forecasting (STF), we employ the M4 benchmark [29].

ETT The Electricity Transformer Temperature (ETT) is a crucial indicator in the electric power long-term deployment. This dataset consists of 2 years data from two separated counties in China. To explore the granularity on the Long sequence time-series forecasting (LSTF) problem, different subsets are created, ETTh1, ETTh2 for 1-hour-level and ETTm1 for 15-minutes-level. Each data point consists of the target value "oil temperature" and 6 power load features. The train/val/test is 12/4/4 months.

ECL Measurements of electric power consumption in one household with a one-minute sampling rate over a period of almost 4 years. Different electrical quantities and some sub-metering values are available. This archive contains 2075259 measurements gathered in a house located in Sceaux (7km of Paris, France) between December 2006 and November 2010 (47 months).

Traffic Traffic is a collection of hourly data from California Department of Transportation, which describes the road occupancy rates measured by different sensors on San Francisco Bay area freeways.

Weather Weather is recorded every 10 minutes for the 2020 whole year, which contains 21 meteorological indicators, such as air temperature, humidity, etc.

ILL The influenza-like illness (ILI) dataset contains records of patients experiencing severe influenza with complications.

M4 The M4 benchmark comprises 100K time series, amassed from various domains commonly present in business, financial, and economic forecasting. These time series have been partitioned into six distinctive datasets, each with varying sampling frequencies that range from yearly to hourly. These series are categorized into five different domains: demographic, micro, macro, industry, and finance.

The datasets' statistics are presented in Table 7.

A.2 Evaluation metrics

We now specify the evaluation metrics we used for comparing different models. We utilize the mean square error (MSE) and mean absolute error (MAE) for long-term forecasting. For the short-term forecasting task on M4 benchmark, we adopt the symmetric mean absolute percentage error (SMAPE), mean absolute scaled error (MASE), and overall weighted average (OWA), following [33]. The

calculations of these metrics are as follows:

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^T (Y_h - \hat{Y}_h)^2, \quad (13)$$

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H |Y_h - \hat{Y}_h|, \quad (14)$$

$$\text{SMAPE} = \frac{200}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H \frac{|Y_h - \hat{Y}_h|}{|Y_h| + |\hat{Y}_h|}, \quad (15)$$

$$\text{MAPE} = \frac{100}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H \frac{|Y_h - \hat{Y}_h|}{|Y_h|}, \quad (16)$$

$$\text{MASE} = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H \frac{|Y_h - \hat{Y}_h|}{\frac{1}{H-s} \sum_{j=s+1}^H |Y_j - Y_{j-s}|}, \quad (17)$$

$$\text{OWA} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\text{SMAPE}}{\text{SMAPE}_{\text{Naive}}} + \frac{\text{MASE}}{\text{MASE}_{\text{Naive}}} \right], \quad (18)$$

where s is the periodicity of the time series data. H denotes the number of data points (i.e., prediction horizon in our cases). Y_h and \hat{Y}_h are the h -th ground truth and prediction where $h \in \{1, \dots, H\}$.

B Appendix: the learned architectures on different tasks

The Table 8 presents the learned architectures via our AutoFormer-TS framework.

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009

Table 7: Dataset statistics. The dimension indicates the number of time series (i.e., channels), and the dataset size is organized in (training, validation, testing).

Tasks	Dataset	Dim.	Series Length	Dataset Size	Frequency	Domain
Long-term Forecasting	ETTm1	7	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(34465, 11521, 11521)	15 min	Temperature
	ETTm2	7	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(34465, 11521, 11521)	15 min	Temperature
	ETTh1	7	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(8545, 2881, 2881)	1 hour	Temperature
	ETTh2	7	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(8545, 2881, 2881)	1 hour	Temperature
	Electricity	321	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(18317, 2633, 5261)	1 hour	Electricity
	Traffic	862	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(12185, 1757, 3509)	1 hour	Transportation
	Weather	21	{96, 192, 336, 720}	(36792, 5271, 10540)	10 min	Weather
	ILI	7	{24, 36, 48, 60}	(617, 74, 170)	1 week	Illness
Short-term Forecasting	M4-Yearly	1	6	(23000, 0, 23000)	Yearly	Demographic
	M4-Quarterly	1	8	(24000, 0, 24000)	Quarterly	Finance
	M4-Monthly	1	18	(48000, 0, 48000)	Monthly	Industry
	M4-Weakly	1	13	(359, 0, 359)	Weakly	Macro
	M4-Daily	1	14	(4227, 0, 4227)	Daily	Micro
	M4-Hourly	1	48	(414, 0, 414)	Hourly	Other

Table 8: The learned architectures on different tasks.

Architecture	ETTh1	ETTh2	ETTm1	ETTm2	M4-yearly
Layer 1: Encoding operation at self-attention	Conv_3	Conv_3	Conv_3	Skip	Conv_5
Layer 1: Encoding operation at FFN	Skip	Skip	Skip	Conv_1	Skip
Layer 1: Attention function	Concat_Attn	Concat_Attn	EP_Attn	Minus_Attn	Dot_Attn
Layer 1: Activation function	Leaky_ReLU	Leaky_ReLU	ELU	GeLU	ReLU
Layer 1: Dimension multiplication factor k	1	2	4	2	1
Layer 2: Encoding operation at self-attention	Skip	Conv_3	Conv_1	Conv_1	Conv_3
Layer 2: Encoding operation at FFN	Skip	Conv_1	Skip	Skip	Conv_3
Layer 2: Attention function	Minus_Attn	Minus_Attn	Bilinear_Attn	Dot_Attn	Dot_Attn
Layer 2: Activation function	SWISH	GeLU	SWISH	GeLU	Leaky_ReLU
Layer 2: Dimension multiplication factor k	0.5	1	4	2	0.5
Layer 3: Encoding operation at self-attention	Conv_3	Conv_1	Skip	Skip	Conv_1
Layer 3: Encoding operation at FFN	Skip	Conv_5	Conv_3	Skip	Conv_3
Layer 3: Attention function	Dot_Attn	Concat_Attn	EP_attn	EP_attn	Dot_Attn
Layer 3: Activation function	ReLU	GeLU	GeLU	Leaky_ReLU	GeLU
Layer 3: Dimension multiplication factor k	1	2	4	1	2